

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/697,561	10/31/2003	Thomas Grafenauer	03100134US	8413	
7055 75	90 08/10/2006		EXAMINER		
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.			DIXON, MERRICK L		
	1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			1774		
			DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006	DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/697,561	GRAFENAUER, THOMAS			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Merrick Dixon	1774			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE is not of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 Ma</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> .	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment	(s)	MERRIC PRIMARY E	K DIXON EXAMINER			
2)  Notice 3)  Infom	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 'No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1774

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3,14,19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prawdzik et al (US 4689102) in view of Ellis (US 4818595).

The cited primary reference to Prawdzik et al teaches the claimed invention including fiberboard floor panel comprising a support board having a decoration printed on top thereon and further covered by a transparent resin- col 1, line 25-65; col 8, lines 42-61. The primary reference fails to expressly teach printing directly on its substrate surfaces. The secondary reference to Ellis , however teaches that it is known in the instant art to both print indirectly and directly on substrates as taught by the primary reference – col 3, lines 15-25; col 6, lines 18-44; col 7, lines 1-10; col 21, lines 14-20; col 22, lines 10-12; col 19, lines 46-50; col 20, lines 31-45; col 20, lines 31-45; col 60, lines 15-20; col 64, lines 7-15; col 68, lines 45-55. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to combine the teaching of the secondary reference and directly print onto the primary reference substrate, in the absence of unexpected results motivated by the desire to impart desired surface characteristics- col 22, lines 13-14. Concerning claim 2, the primary reference teaches decorated prints on its underside- col 9, lines 10-18. the secondary reference also teaches this aspect in

Art Unit: 1774

col 62, lines 62- col 63, line 5; col 22, lines 1-10; col 60, lines 57-61; col 61-lines 30-45. Concerning claim 3, the primary reference teaches corundum particles in col 3, lines 50-65; col 10, lines 29-64. Concerning claim 14, the reference teaches multilayered panel-col 9, lines 10-18; see entire reference. the secondary reference teaches directly printing on its substrate's surface, as required by claim 19 and discussed above. The primary reference teaches similar material as required by claim 20- see entire references' teachings.

3. Claims 6,7,10,17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prawdzik et al('102) in view of Ellis (US 4818595)..

The primary reference teaches the claimed invention including the process for making fiberboard comprising printing a decoration on the substrate surface, spreading resin material via roller means and further causing same layers to be pressed together- col 8, lines 56- col 9, line 9. The primary reference fails to teach printing on its substrate's surface. The secondary reference to Ellis , however teaches that it is known in the instant art to both print indirectly and directly on substrate surfaces as taught by the primary reference – col 3, lines 15-25; col 6, lines 18-44; col 7, lines 1-10; col 21, lines 14-20; col 22, lines 10-12; col 19, lines 46-50; col 20, lines 31-45; col 20, lines 31-45; col 60, lines 15-20; col 64, lines 7-15; col 68, lines 45-55. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to combine the teaching of the secondary reference and directly print onto the primary reference substrate's

Art Unit: 1774

surface, in the absence of unexpected results motivated by the desire to impart desired surface characteristics- col 22, lines 13-14. Concerning claims 10,17 and 18, the primary reference teaches printing steps in col 1, lines 61-65; col 9, lines 10-15. Concerning claim 7, the primary claimed particles in col 4, lines 50-52.

4. Claims 8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prawdzik et al(US 3192294) and Ellis (US 4818595) as applied to claims 6,7,10,17,18 above, and further in view of Streed et al('294).

The obvious combined teachings of Prawdzik et al(US 3192294) and Ellis (US 4818595) teaches the claimed process as discussed above. Such teachings, however, fails to expressly teach the aspect to forming a relief in its product's surface. The secondary reference to Streed et al, however, teaches that it is known in the art to impart relief decorations in similarly patented flooring devices as the primary reference-col 1, lines 16-19; col 3, lines 59-75; col 1, lines 27-36; col 4, lines 1-5. Concerning claims 11-13, the Prawdzik et al reference teaches the aspect of cutting its product to desired sizes in col 1, lines 30-36.

5. Claims 4,5,15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prawdzik et al(US 3192294) and Ellis (US 4818595) as applied to claims 1-3,14,19 and 20 above, and further in view of Steed et al('294).

Art Unit: 1774

The obvious combined teachings of Prawdzik et al(US 3192294) and Ellis (US 4818595) teaches the claimed invention including fiberboard articles as discussed in section 3 above, inter alla. such combined teachings, however, fails to expressly teach the aspect of including a relief in its product's surface. The reference to Streed et al, however, teaches that it is known in the art to provide relief decoration in similarly patented flooring devices as the primary reference- col 1, lines 16-19; col 3, lines 59-75. ;col 1, lines 27-36; col 4, lines 1-5. Concerning claims 5,15 and 16, the Steed et al reference expressly teaches relief patterns- col 1, lines 27-30; col 3, lines 61-68.

- 6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1774

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Raghava( US 4374886) is cited of interest for its respective teachings and

additionally to show the state of the art.

8

Applicants who wish to send a facsimile (draft copies) for the examiner's immediate

review can do so by using the Examiner's personal fax number at 571-273-1520. The

faxing of all papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096

O.G. 30 (November 15, 1989). NOTE: All facsimiles sent to the examiner's

personal fax number should be in draft-forms and will be treated as informal.

Same facsimiles will not be entered in the related applications unless

otherwise agreed and noted by the examiner.

The fax number for all other fascimile is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1774

Information about the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Information Retrieval system (Private PAIR).

Status inquires for published applications may be retrieved from either Private PAIR

or Public PAIR. Questions about the PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic

Business Center at 866-217-9197.

Any questions concerning the instant communication should be directed to Examiner

Dixon, at 571-272-1520, Mondays to Thursdays, between 12 noon and 8 PM, eastern

time. The examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Rena Dye, can be reached at 571-272-3186.

Merrick Dixon

**Primary Examiner** 

**Group 1700**